App. F. IX-4

Previous References

Mug 65-23 1-10.
80-24 1-2.
" 80-24-3.
" 75-25-1-10.

Later References

Mug 256-40-1-2.

1930-31
(Mug)

File No. 62-30.

Serial Nos. 1-4.5

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. ~~4~~. 5

Part B for March 1932.

SUBJECT.

Mug: Appeal no. 13 of 30-31. re. the Management of the Sri Chowdeswari Temple Rama Setty Pet. Bangalore City (Appointment of Dharmadarsis)

Memo No. 1355 Mug. Comm.
1356 Dtn. to Chick Veeraiah.
1357 to R. Gundu Rao, Advocate.
1358 V. R. Vasudeva Sastry. Do.
1359 Comm. Dtn. to Yegnaraman Pantulu

General and Revenue Secretariat | Inwd File No. 62 of 193

Serial No.

Letter no P C S 1/29-30 dated the 30th/31st July 1930 from the Inspr. Genl of Police requesting, for reasons given the cancellation of the order of Govt K. Chandy, (while he was the Inspr. Genl) appointing one Yajaman Click Venkatha as the sole trustee of the Sri Chowdeswari Temple at Ramasettipet, Bangalore City and recommending the appointment of a Committee of Dharma Dasis to manage the affairs of the Temple instead of Yajaman Click Venkatha as Commissioner.

1) The Inspr. Genl's letter explains the facts of the case and it has been decided, after consulting the Law Member, to accept his proposal for orders. No further change is necessary in the present Yajaman Click Venkatha

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 02328—GPB—10,000—22-4-30

Travancore File No 62 of 1930 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

brought to notice by the Travancore Legation.

P.L. 9781L

H. Lacy) 14.8.30

a) Vide note in linked file. (The note sheet may be Continued.)

30/8/30.

P.L.O

2320/2018

Note–Contn Sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 62 of 193

Serial No.	
2	Petn dated 18th August 1930 from one Yajaman Chikka Veerappa, Sole Trustee Sri Chowdeswari temple Ramannapet, Bangalore city that he may not be disturbed from his sole Dharmakarteeship of the temple. 3) The recommendation of the M.C. about the appointment of a set of Dharmakartas in place of the present sole Dharmakartaship one Chikka Veerappa invested, submitted, adverts to the H Secy for orders on 14/8/30 as P.no 165. 4) If approved, this may be filed for orders E.G. M&R 19/8/30 H. Secy 19.8.30 5) The papers are not fully referred or flagged. 6) 1) The records referred to in para 5 of the petition

2320/2018

Note—Contn Sheet

WD 02328—GPB—10,000—22 4-30

Serial No

be examined and it should be noted if the enquiry has shown mismanagement at the hands of the petitioner -

2) Is it borne out from the records that - the Counter petitioners were given no opportunity to oppose - their case before Mr. Chandy passed the order now proposed to be revised by Mr. Bourne -

3) The references in the letter bearing on the allegations made in paras 7 & 8 of the petition marked A & B also to be put up -

In the light of the above, the case may be further worked on and if all the materials necessary for the disposal of the case are available, the question of hearing both parties may be considered, as urged in para 4 of the petition -

30/8/20 1.9.20

I With reference to orders at page 6 of the notes, supra it is submitted that a perusal of the records does not disclose any mismanagement on the part of Chidambaram Chettiar or his ancestors. It may be noted that the Fy Commrs order dated the 17th May 1924 was passed after hearing a Committee of Panchayatdars consisting of five persons

Fy Comrs

Note–Contn Sheet

Serial No.

Fags 1 & 2

with two Chittarancappa as the Petitioners on the strength of the decision of Sir S.T. Krishna murthi, and the decision of the Sole Judge of Bangalore that it is desirable to entrust the management of the temple to a committee of three persons

8 Against this order the two Chikka Veerappa obtained to Court on 28/7/24 appeal against this order (notice of the 8th Defendant & prayed that he might be appointed the Sole Dharmadarsi of the institution. This petition was presented to the Applicants for appearing to the D.C. in the matter in the first instance This the petitioners did ~~not~~ on 18/9/24. On the report of the Amildar, Bangalore North and of the S.T.D. Bangalore the 8th Defendant, Bangalore Dt. he recommended in his letter dated the 12th July 1925 to the Munsiff Chan-

Fags 1 2 + 2 2

Fags 1

NOTE.—Continue on Sheet

that the management of the institution might be entrusted to Mr Chikkanarayya as the sole Dharmadarsi and this was sanctioned by Mr K Chandy on 17-2 1925 on certain conditions It is not clear from the available records whether the appointment of Mr Chikkanarayya became final & binding or not by Mr Chandy dropping his proposal, against this order, Messrs Narayappa, Nanjundiah & Ramiah applied ~~to the~~ on 4.7.25 to the M.C. for a reconsideration of the order no. R Dis 156-24-5 dated the 17th July 1925 of Mr Chandy and requested that a committee might be appointed to manage the affairs of the institution as was in force formerly. On receipt of this application the M C has in his letter dated 30 July 1930 recommended to Govt that the order of Mr K Chandy directing the appointment of Mr Chikkanarayya

General and Revenue Secretariat — Exty File No. 62 of 1930

Serial No.

as the sole Dharmakarta of the institution might be cancelled and a Board of management might be appointed to manage the institution.

9. Per contra the Chettiar manager in his petition prayed that he might be continued sole Dharmakarta as heretofore, and requests that he might be heard in person before final orders are passed by Govt on the M's proposal.

10 An examination of the records does not show any mismanagement on the part of the present sole Dharmakarta nor does the M.L. say that the management has been found unsatisfactory. It is already stated above the M's office file on the subject does not contain information as to whether the allotments of the Chettiar managers were fair & adequate or not

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 02328—GPB—10,000—22-4-30

Serial No 57

order 17.2.1925 has been passed

12. Our Chikkaiyengar's petition marked (A) by the Judge is marked Y, in the file cards and the counter petition marked (B) by the Judge is marked S in the records.

13 A perusal of the records forwarded by the Dy. C. and the authorities quoted by Mr Chikka Veeraiya in continuation of his claim to be continued as the sole Dharma dharsi it is seen that no charge of mismanagement has been brought forward or framed against the sole Dharma dharsi and if assumed the petition of Mr Chikka veeraiya might be forwarded to the Hon'ble H.C. for opinion, with reference to records, & after receipt of same the case might, if necessary be posted for hearing, if agreed. Submitted for orders.

Note—Contn Sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 62 of 1930.

Serial No.

14 [With reference to Secy orders at para 5 of the notes supra it is respectfully submitted that the decree of the Lusi Nadu not executable in appeal when the petition was received & entertained as it had been entertained some time previously to the Dt of Secy.—]
C.C.
30/9

15 It appears fair that an opportunity should be given to the parties to appear in person or through their Counsel, before Govt to urge their respective claims. But before doing so, the file may perhaps be sent U.O. to the present Muzarai Commissioner for furnishing his opinion on the points urged by Mr. Chick Veerappa in his present petition

(P.C.D. 2,
H. Secy)
15/1

OFFICE OF THE ... 1930
22 OCT. 1930
No. 4020

3806/8.F

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 0238—GPB—18,000—22.4.

File No .of 192

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 62 of 1930.

Serial No.

17 Mr Chandy's order was passed in 1925 & the present matter can only now not even as an appeal but in a suit from the M.C. Is there no limitation in these matters. Kindly see if any management appeal can be. Is it necessary to obtain for this interpn now?

18 Draft Letter for approval
29/10

19 Issue
30.10.30

To.
3 The Mcy Comr
No 978 of 31-10-30.
With reference to all enquiries if there is no rule of limitation in such matters and whether it is necessary desirable for Govt to
20 ~~Draft~~ Acknowledgment may be sent to Mr M Kamalambika Amo, Advocate, in reply of the applicant

9/11/30

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 02328—GPB—10,000—22.4.30

Library File No 87 of 1930 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

on behalf of Sri Chikka Veerappa is issued for signature

C.S. Mark
8/11/30

21 Issue
VS
3.11.30

No 1096 Dy. 4 11 30

To

N. M. Ramachandra Rao Advocate B'lore

I inform him that the petition enclosed submitted by him on behalf of Sri Chikkaveerappa is receiving attention.

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT. 5 NOV 1930 MUZRAI.

Letter No. S.R.S. 29-30 dated the 7th & 8th April 1931 from the Land Revenue Commissioner requesting for certain information that some directions might be issued in the communication of his predecessor in the matter of the cancellation of his appointment as Sri Chikka Veerappa as the Sole Dharmadarsi of the Sri Chowdeswari temple at Ramanagaram, Bangalore City

Note–Contn. Sheet

B-0 — 31

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 62 of 1930.

Serial No.

22) Refer orders of the Members of Council at para 11 of the Hon'ble Supra. Submitted for orders
C.S.-M.S.K.
9/4/31 H. Secy)

VS
10.4.31

OFFICE OF THE FIRST I... COUNCIL
16 APR 1931
No. 1161

24) The parties may be heard on a suitable date.

18/ Member) 15/4/31

25) Mins.

26) For orders if this may be posted to 16th May 1931 along with other cases. The file will be sent to the A.G. & Mr. for obtg. orders
27/4.

yes
27.

25) P.G. to I Mr with compliments
Secy
27/4/31

1334
27/4

Note—Contn. Sheet

File No .of 192

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

Note–Contn. Sheet

Sole Dharmadarsi ... Mgr.

General and Revenue Secretariat

Muz. File No. 62 of 1930.

App. F. III—2]

Serial No.

30 This case was heard on 16th May 1931.

31 The parties were present: the petitioner was represented by Mr. M.Ramachandra Rao and the respondents by Mr. Gundu Rao and Mr. V.L. Lakshmi Sastri.

---

32) This is a public institution in enjoyment of a cash inam grant. The appointment of the appellant as the sole Dharmadarsi is not acceptable to a section of the devotees of the temple and the case has to be dealt with on the lines suggested by the Muzrai Commissioner in his letter dated 30th July 1930. It would, however, be desirable if the two parties came to an amicable arrangement between themselves in regard to the persons to be entrusted with the management of the institution. This was suggested to them and the two lawyers asked for time to try to effect a settlement by compromise and report it. This request has been granted. May be put up two months hence or earlier if the promised report is received earlier.

No. 169

q

OFFICE ... No. 453.

No report of compromise is so far received. 18.5.31

Note-Cards Sheet

First Member 17.7.31

PO—GPB—5

al and Revenue
Secretariat

Mu 3 File No. 62 of 1930.

36) Remarks were issued—
No 502 of 6.10.31 to Mr Yajaman—
Chicacolam tahsildar - Remanana per Bangalore city.
Nos 453 & 454 of 28-9-31
to Messrs Gundu Rao and
V. R. Vasudeva Sastri
Advocates - Rampachodi.

(17

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat, Mis. File No. 62 of 1930.

Serial No.

Representation dt. 2. 12. 31 from Mr. Vaijnath Patel was praying that for various reasons set forth therein he and after him his descendants may kindly be appointed as Comm... on the Committee of Dharmada for the Management of Sri Chandeshwari Temple Ramnamapatti city.

3) Kind reference is invited to paras 3, 6, 7 and 9(4) of the P. Un D. It is submitted that the records bear out that the petitioner has spent Rs 6375-0-0 of his own money to rebuild the temple - (Vide page 76 of the account Book). The local authorities after auditing the accounts on 10/8/23 have certified to the above said amount having been spent by the petitioner from his own purse - from it is respectfully submitted that at every stage in the records it is reported by the Mamlatdar officers that the petitioner has been rendering a good deal of - in terms in the management of the temple affairs.

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 62 of 1930 - 1

On 31.7.30 the H.C. recommended that a Committee of Dharmadarsis be appointed with the Hon. Mr. Chidambaram as Convenor and Managing Dharmadarsi - This has been referred to in the minutes in para 32 (page 15 of the Diary) Added with the petitioner prays that the Convenorship may be allowed at least to rest with him and the members of his family - By way of encouraging him to do further good to the Institution his prayer may perhaps be complied with -

38) Filed for orders —

8/12 1st Member VS

18.12.31

39) Please ask the Lawyers of the two parties if any understanding has been arrived at.

40) Kind ref. is invited to this office letters nos 453 & 454 dt 28.9.31 addressed to the Advocates for Respondents in the Case & they were asked to send us a reply before the close of Oct. 1931 The Advocate for the Petitioner could not be addressed since he was appointed one of the Judges of the High Court & he as the

Received 28 DEC 1931 No. 3932

news 21/12/31 — hi VS

41) J

Serial No.

Letter dt 23-12-31 from Mr Vasudeva Sastri Advocate for Shankarappa, one of the Respondents.

had no junior to whom he could entrust the case. Hence the Petitioner himself was addressed to state if any amicable understanding was arrived at. His reply & his request for leave appointed as a hereditary Carvenor are as in P. & W. 1 (Vide also notes in para 37)

42 Reply from Mr Vasudeva Sastri Advocate for Mr Shankarappa one of the Respondents has since been received. The request is that Mr Shankarappa, Rajaman of the Nan-Devanga Community may be appointed as one of the Dharmadarsis

43 No reply from Mr Eswara Rao Advocate for the remaining Respondents has yet been received in spite of a reminder fixing the date of Sat^h Viz before the close of Oct^r 1931. If not, his reply will be awaited till the 15th of the current month within which time if no reply is received from him the papers will be put up for orders on 16th inst.

Gen 6/11/31 44 The other adv. may be reminded if appd

WD 0255—50,000—GPB 4-1 Dft subd 4-11-31

124 — 41

NOTE—Contn Sheet

Ramsetty pet Chowdeswari temple

General and Revenue Secretariat

1111/2, File No. 62 of 1930.

Issued reminder No 7497 dt 12/1/32 to Mr. Venkatarao Advocate Bellary requesting Counter affidavit reply before the 20th instant.

Sent to me 20th inst. 14/1/32

47) In this case Mr. Venkatarao is the Counsel for the Telugu Devanga Petitioners Messrs Narayappa, Narasimhaiya & Ramaiya Counter on 28.9.31 he was asked to send his reply before the close of Oct 1931 - There was no response - Again he was reminded to send his reply if any before the 20th inst. No reply has been received from him.

48) Order for orals: Vide the minutes of the meeting in para 32. Reply from the other two is awaited - 37+42 -

I Member) 4/1 Feb 1931

49) We may wait for a month More

Month 25/1/32

No reply from the Advocate for certain of the Respondents has been received Since 5 orders

Issue B 25.2.32

24/2/32

50) 2 9.3.32.

7/3/32

5303

Serial No.

55 This case was heard on the 10th May 1931 and as the parties agreed to effect a settlement by compromise, their request was granted and they were required to report the understanding arrived at. The parties have been unable to settle the differences between them and the case has, therefore, to be decided on its merits.

56 The Sree Chowdeswari Temple, Ramasettipet, Bangalore City, is a Muzrai institution in receipt of a cash inam grant and it should therefore be dealt with as a public institution. The appointment of the petitioner Yejman Chick Veerappa as the sole Dharmadarsi of the Institution is not acceptable to a section of the devotees of the Temple and the appointment, as suggested by the Muzrai Commissioner, of a Board of Dharmadarsis for conducting its management is desirable. The Temple is, however, in receipt of only a small cash grant of Rs 1-3-4 per month and its maintenance in a proper condition depends upon the interest of its chief devotees who have made or are expected to make substantial cash contributions towards its maintenance. It is seen from the records that the petitioner Mr. Chick Veerappa and his family have evinced considerable interest in improving the resources of the Institution and it is desirable,
Temple should be observed
port of this family. Mr. Chick Veerappa

WD 2087—GPB—500—25-5-31

Serial No.

therefore, as suggested by the Muzrai Commissioner be made the Convener of the Committee of Dharmadarsis. In his representation dated 2nd December 1931 Mr. Chick Veerappa prays that, if he cannot be appointed as the sole Dharmadarsi, the office of the Convener at least might be allowed to be held hereditarily by the members of his family. A convener's place cannot be permitted to be treated as a hereditary office. If the family of Mr. Chick Veerappa takes in the future in the Institution the same interest as it has done in the past and also if there are persons among the members of that family competent to hold the office of the Convener, one of them might be permitted to continue to hold it. The Committee of Dharmadarsis now to be appointed might consist of Chick Veerappa as its Convener and a minimum number of members to represent the different sections of the Temple's devotees.

(7) All receipts of the Temple, from whatever source, should be kept in the Government Savings Bank in an account in the name of the Temple and all monies required for expenses should be drawn from that account. The Convener may be authorised to operate upon this account. Proper accounts should be kept of all receipts and charges of the Temple and produced for inspection whenever called for. All items of expenditure should be supported by payees' receipts.

TYPING SECTION 28 MAR 1932 FILE

WD 2087—OPS—500—25-5-31

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 62 of 1930.

Serial No.	
5	Memo Nos. 1355, 1356, 1357, 1358, 1359 dt 29.3.32 communicating the minutes in paras 56 & 57 of the Mcts to the Hon. C. Rev. M. Chickaveerappa, M. R. Sundara Rao advocate, M. V. R. Vasudeva Sastry, Addl. M. Yegamma Papamma dismd.

B 31/3/32

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 70—GBPM—60,000—13-8-31

File No. of 193 General and Revenue Secretariat

M. C. 13]

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
31 JULY
No.

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 30th July 1930.

31.

No. PCS Ea 47 files 29.30

GENL & FEV SECRETARIAT
1 AUG 1930
165
MUZRAI.

FROM

Rajakaryapravina
P. G. D'SOUZA, ESQ., B.A., B.L., Muz 62-30-1
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

Subject:-Appointment of Dharmadarsis to the Sri Chowdeswari temple at Ramasettypet, Bangalore City.

SIR,

In forwarding herewith the vernacular records relating to the above subject, I have the honor to state as follows:--

Cash grant Register No.

The Sri Chowdeswari temple is a Muzrai Institution with a cash grant of Re.1-3-4 per month. On 4th July 1929 Setty Ranjappa, Yajaman Nanjundayya and Yajaman Ramiah of Rama Setty Pet presented a petition (enclosed in the file) to this office bringing to notice that they along with one Yajaman Chick Veeranna (counter petitioner, had been appointed Dharmadarsis of the temple in question, as per Gazette notification dated 22nd May 1924 but that now Yajaman ----- Chickveerappa was acting independently of them collecting rents -- from shops belonging to the temple and was not giving any account of the expenditure and that the behaviour of Chikveeranna was --- creating dis-satisfaction in the minds of the Telugu and Tamil Devanga communities, to which as well as to the Sivachar ... the temple belonged and praying that a committee of four persons -- including Chikveerappa and themselves and a fifth member, if necessary, might be appointed to manage the affairs of the institution. A report was called for from the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore City on the receipt of the same the said petitioners presented on 10-3-1930 when the parties through their advocates were heard.

It is seen from this office file ... dated 17th February last (enclosed) ... that ...

Muzrai Commissioner on the recommendation of the Deputy Commissioner and in pursuance of the provision contained in Government Order No.770-81/Muz.80-24-2 dated 28th November 1924 passed an order appointing Yajaman Chickveerappa as sole Dharmadarsi of the temple in question and subject to certain conditions, and continuing the office in his family so long as they satisfactorily discharge the work in the best interests of the temple, of which Government will be the sole judge. In passing this order it does not appear that opportunity was given to the present petitioners who were also the Dharmadarsis as per Gazette notification referred to above to represent their case.

The previous orders as disclosed by the copies (enclosed in the file) of the judgment of the Sub Court, the Deputy Commissioner and the late Sir, P.N. (then Mr.) Krishnamurti, then Assistant Commissioner, do not lend support to the decision arrived at by Mr. Chandy. Sir, P.N. Krishnamurti in his order dated 8th January 1880 had directed that the temple in question should be left in the management of Setty Mallappa, grand-father of the 1st petitioner Yajaman Chennappa, grand father of the 2nd petitioner, Yajaman ---- Venkataramanappa, grand-father of the 3rd petitioner, and Yajaman Siddarajappa, father of the counter-petitioner. The judgment of the Sub Judge dated 8th April 1886 (copy enclosed in the file) shows that the Sub Judge also did not approve of the appointment of a sole manager for the temple but was for having a committee of managers (Dharmadarsis).

Thus, it is clear that the decision of Mr. Chandy is against the weight of evidence of several years. I am of opinion that it is not also in the best interests of the institution, which has ---- as its devotees besides members belonging to the faction of the counter petitioner, members belonging to that of the petitioners. It is not also fair to a large section of devotees of the temple, who are against the appointment of Mr. Chik Veerappa as sole --- Dharmadarsi to permit him to be one such. Even the persons in favour of the counter petitioner are not inclined to support him in this demand of his. As the order was passed by Mr. Chandy -

I have no power to review it.

I therefore submit the papers for the orders of Government and beg to recommend that the orders of Mr. Chanay may be revise and a committee of Dharmadarsis be appointed with the counter-petitioner Mr. Chik Veerappa as convenor and managing Dharmadarsi as existed previously, in view of the interest Mr.Chik-Veerappa has evinced in improving the resources of the institution and the Yajmans of the three other communities as other - Dharmadarsis. The order directing the continuance of the --- sole Dharmadarsi office in the family of Chik Veerappa may be cancelled.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.



GENL. & FEV. SECRETARIAT
19 AUG 1930
254
MUZRAI.

OFFICE OF THE
FIRST ME... OIL
18 AUG. 1930
No. M. 70.

Muz b2-30-2

18

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Muzrai Petition No. of 1930-31.

1818

19.8.31

PETITIONER:- --(Vs.)-- COUNTER-PETITIONERS:-

Yajaman Chickveerappa, Sole Manager, Sri Chowdeswari Temple, Ramannanapet, BANGALORE CITY.

(A) 1. Setti Nanjappa,
2. Yajaman Nanjundiah, and
3. Yajaman Ramaiya.

(B) 1. Yajaman Shankarappa, and
2. Yajaman Papanna.

****

FACTS OF THE CASE.

1. The Petitioner, who was the Vyvatdar of Sri Ramalinga Chowdeswari Temple situate in Ramannanapet, Bangalore City, was conferred the Sole Managership in perpetual descendency - by the Order No. R.Dis.156/24-25 of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, passed on 17-2-1925, and since then, the Petitioner has been the Sole Manager of the said Temple in perpetuity.

2. As the Counter-Petitioners petitioned

petitioned the Muzrai Commissioner to include them in the List of Dharmadarsis, their petition was registered as Muz. Mis. No. 5/29-30, and this case was reserved for Judgment after the completion of the necessary Enquiries and after the Arguments of the Counsels of both the Parties were heard on 10-3-1930.

3. When the Petitioner went and enquired at the Muzrai Commissioner's Office as to how the case stood, he came to know that the case had been referred to Government and that Final Orders were awaited.

4. The Petitioner humbly requests that he might be given an opportunity to be heard in the case before Final Orders are passed by Government.

--:oOo:--

NOW THIS HUMBLE PETITION OF THE PETITIONER MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:--

1. That, at the time of the Inam Settlement, there were in the said Temple (i) Sri Ramalinga Chowdeswari, (ii) Sri Rameswara and (iii) Parvathi Idols, out of which the Government were pleased to pay a Cash Grant of a sum of Rs.1-3-4 ONLY to Sri Chowdeswari Idol abovenamed. Besides this small amount, there is absolutely

absolutely no other source of income to the Temple, nor is there any Inamthi conferred on the same.

2. That the reason for not having - conferred any Grant (of Government) on the other two Idols, viz., Sri Rameswara and Parvathi, is that, about 70-80 years ago, t h e direct ancestors of the Petitioner consecrated and installed the Idols of Sree Rameswara and Parvathi, and have since ordained that the Worships, etc., should be performed of these two Deities at their own cost from posterity - to posterity; and it is this reason of private consecration and private arrangements to conduct Worships, etc., from out of the funds of the Petitioner's ancestors in their time and their descendants after them, that did not call for Government help by way of any Cash Grant or Inamthi, etc.

3. The Petitioner, for his own part - and in his time, has recently consecrated and installed freshly two more Idols of Sri Shanmukha Swamy and Veerabhadra Swamy in the Temple, at his own cost, and has been conducting the Worship, etc., of these Deities also from out of his private funds.

4. The father of the Petitioner, named Sidda Rachappa, with a view to procure License for

for the conduct of the Utsavam of Sri Rameswara Swamy, as also to afford proper facilities to the Devotees in the matter of the Worship of Sree Chowdeswari, included the names of the fathers of the Counter-Petitioners (A) 1, 2 and 3 in the petition submitted for the grant of the requisite License to conduct the said Utsavam of Sri Rameswara Swamy. It was only for the purpose of procuring the License abovesaid, that the names of the other persons were included in the Petition for License, and so this cannot be deemed to confer any rights or claims on the Counter-Petitioners' ancestors or on their descendants through them, in the matter of the Temple Management.

5. In the year 1922-23, the three Counter-petitioners of (A) Group instigated the Archak of the Temple and petitioned the Authorities concerned complaining that the Temple affairs were being mismanaged seriously and setting forth false, vexatious and unfounded allegations. Thereupon, serious as the matter was, a Regular Enquiry was instituted in the Court of the Amildar of Bangalore Taluk, in the course of which the following facts were elucidated and recorded:-

(a) That it was the ancestors of the Petitioner that consecrated and installed the

the Idols of Sri Rameswara Swamy and Parvathi;

(b) That the Petitioner, in the year 1908, demolished the old building and got a new structure built at a cost of about 4 to 5 Thousand Rupees;

(c) That the Petitioner, again, got Four - Shops built in the Temple Premises - (at the roadside), thus arranging for a good source of income for the Worship, etc., of the Deities;

(d) That he also got built, at his own cost, one Gopuram for the Temple;

(e) That it was also proved by this Enquiry that the Petitioner was causing the - Daily Worship, (Nitya Katle) as also - the Extras (Hetchu Katle) to be done at his own cost, and regularly too.

These facts were also admitted by the above-named 3 Counter-petitioners themselves, besides their having been proved by the ample testimony of unimpeachable Documents available in the Records connected with the Temple. It was also recorded by the Amildar that there was no Mismanagement of the Temple affairs at any time. After all this was done, the Counter-petitioners Nos. 1 and 2 of Group (A), and Nos. 1 and 2 of

Group

Group (B) were made Dharmadarsis of the Temple, appointing the Petitioner as the CONVENER (the Dharmadarsis being meant to help the Petitioner).

6. With all the elucidations of the above facts, the enquiry ended and resulted quite unsatisfactorily to the Petitioner who, by his having been appointed the Convener, thereby lost his position and status of the Sole Managership which he was enjoying before.

7. Aggrieved, therefore, by this Order and arrangement, as also by the fact that the Counter-petitioners got a new Right to - Dharmadarship in the affairs of the Temple, the Petitioner, on 21-7-1924, petitioned the Benign Government setting out his grievances in detail and praying that his right as the Sole Manager of the Temple be revived and that there be no new right created in favour of the Counter-petitioners. This petition having been forwarded to the Bangalore District Deputy Commissioner, the late Mr. B.Venkoba Rao, for opinion, His Honour was pleased, after a detailed enquiry into the case and after a thorough examination of the records connected, to opine that the Petitioner possessed a right to the Sole Managership of the Temple, and accordingly recommended the same in favour of the Petitioner. Upon this, the Muzrai Commissioner

was

was pleased to issue the Order first above - quoted, (viz.,.No. R.Dis. 156/24-25, dated 17-2-1925) which was duly given for Publication in the Mysore Gazette, declaring t h e Petitioner as being entitled to the Sole - Managership,in perpetuity from posterity to posterity, of the Temple. Thereupon, t h e Taluk Authorities took a Mutchalika from the Petitioner enjoining him to act up to t h e terms of the said Order. THE PETITIONER,FOR HIS OWN PART, HAS BEEN, AS USUAL, ACTING UP - TO THE VERY LETTER OF THE ORDER. When all this has been said and done, this is ample - proof that the Final Order has been already passed in the said Order itself, and no other or further Final Order need be passed in the same matter in anywise whatsoever.

8. After all this was done, the 3rd Counter-petitioner of Group (A), i.e., Yajaman Ramiah, on 25-5-1925, petitioned the Government setting forth the allegation that, as he was the Dharmadarsi before (WHICH I S A BASE LIE AND WHICH CANNOT BE SUBSTANTIATED FOR A MOMENT), he should be also included as a Dharmadarsi. - Upon this petition of the said Yajaman Ramaiya, an Endorsement was issued to him on 30-9-1925 - stating that the Government see no reason to interfere in the matter and concede his request,as the Sole Manager for the Temple had already been appointed.

9. That,

9. That, again, the same Yajaman - Ramaiya has petitioned the Muzrai Commissioner praying for his being appointed Dharmadarsi of the Temple, for which purpose, he - has also instigated the other two persons, viz., Counter-petitioners Nos. 1 and 2 of the Group (A), to join him. Their petition has now been registered as Muzrai Mis. No. 5 of 29-30 on the file of the Muzrai Commissioner's Court. As already set forth above, t h i s Yajaman Ramaiya's claim has been set aside for the appointment of Dharmadarsi (as set forth in the Order of Government dated 30-9-1925 - shown in para 8 above), and so he has no locus standi in the Muz. Mis. Case No.5 of 1929-30 - on the file of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

10. Now, the taking up on file of the said Muzrai Mis. Case No. 5 of 29-30 is not sound and is otherwise illegal, as it is time-barred, the same having been brought 5 years - after the Promulgation of the Government Order (referred to in para 7 supra) in the Mysore Gazette.

11. As regards the 1st Counter-petitioner, Setti Nanjappa, it is important to observe that he is declared an Insolvent and as such is disqualified to hold any responsible - position in the affairs of the management of the Temple which requires the services only of respectable

respectable and reliable persons.

12. A word about the Documents produced by the Counter-petitioners to prove - their own title for the position claimed by them in the Temple affairs, is not out of place here, because, while all the said Documents, or any of them, cannot disprove t h e Petitioner's right for the Sole Managership, cannot in anywise establish their own right or title separately in the Temple Management beyond their having been taken for the help to obtain the License to conduct the Utsavams (as stated in para 4 supra); nor can it be seen in the light of those Documents that the Government have at any time recognised their Huk for the Dharmadarsiship.

13. Besides the above, when this same case was referred to the then Deputy Commissioner (the late Mr. B.Venkoba Rao), with respect to the License to be granted to conduct the Utsavams, he was pleased to observe that the License should be obtained in the usual - procedure, AS PER MAMOOL, thus conferring upon the Counter-petitioners only the right of being included in the License Petition, which - cannot for a moment be misconstrued to mean that they were given any separate rights in the management as such of the Temple. The Petitioner -

Petitioner also took no objection to the said opinion of Mr. B. Venkoba Rao, since his right as Sole Manager was not in jeopardy.

14. What is significant in this case is that no complaint has been submitted by any Devotees of the Temple against the management of the Temple affairs by the Petitioner. It is only the Counter-petitioners, who have been - from the very beginning carrying on a vexatious, persistent and malicious campaign against the Petitioner, that have been raking up this question every now and then, seeing that at no time their contention did stand, their principal object being not at all the interests of the Temple or Devotees, but to unseat the Petitioner - and cause him disgrace, vexation and worry. None of them has helped in any way in the affairs of the Temple at any time.

15. The Petitioner, on the other hand, has spent Thousands of Rupees for the sake of - the Temple in question with all devotion, where none else has done so much, as can be seen in Sub-paras (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of para 5 above. He is a very respectable merchant of a very reputed family of Bangalore, and his dereliction of duty towards the Temple has not been proved at any time. If, therefore, at the instance of the evil-minded Counter-petitioners, and for none of Petitioner's fault, the Petitioner

Petitioner be unseated and disgraced, he not only feels that much Injustice and hardship have been caused to him, but also entertains grave and reasonable fears about the good conduct of the Temple management at the hands of the Counter-petitioners who have at no - time contributed even a single pie towards - the up-keep, management or other affairs of the Temple, where, all along, it is the Petitioner and his direct ancestors that have - borne the brunt of all the expenses, etc., pertaining to the Temple.

16. If, however, it is still to be - deemed that any Security is necessary from the Petitioner as to the regular and satisfactory conduct of the Temple management, he is ready and willing to furnish the same to the satisfaction of the Government.

17. If, with all this, the Counter-petitioners have got anything to establish - with respect to their Title, etc., they may be ordered to seek redress in a competent Court of Law.

18. UNDER THE ABOVE CIRCUMSTANCES, THE PETITIONER MOST HUMBLY AND RESPECTFULLY PRAYS - THAT the Benign Government may be graciously -

pleased

pleased not to disturb the time-honoured position of the Petitioner as the S o l e. M a n a g e r of the Temple in question at the instance of anybody, and confirm - the same to the Petitioner as his Family Right to be handed down from posterity to posterity.

For which act of kindness, Justice, Equity and timely Help rendered to - the Petitioner, he shall ever, as in duty bound, remain grateful.

Bangalore,
18th August 1930.

P E T I T I O N E R.

Advocate for Petr.



Government of His Highness the Maharaja

IN THE ~~CHIEF COURT~~ OF MYSORE, BANGALORE

Misc. Petition No. of 1930 —1931

Petitioner
~~Appellant~~ Respondent

Yajaman Chikkaveeraffa } Vs. {

I the Petitioner above-named do hereby appoint and nominate **Messrs. M. Ramachandra Rao, B.A., B.L., Advocate, High Court of Madras, and Chief Court of Mysore, and M. Seshadri, B.A., LL.B., Advocate,** in the above case, and do hereby empower the said Advocates to appear for and on my behalf in the above case, to take all steps which may be necessary on my behalf arising out of or in connection with the above case either during progress or after its decision, to sign and subscribe their names to any document which they may deem proper, to execute any decree that may be passed in my favour and to receive out of the Court any refund of money which may be lodged or become payable or receivable on my behalf and on receipt thereof to grant receipts or other sufficient discharges for the same, to withdraw, compromise or refer to arbitration the said case, to appoint one or more substitutes and to act and perform all other matters and things relating thereto or connected therewith, to represent me in matters relating to the same and to act as fully and effectually to all intents and purposes as I might do if personally present and did the same. And I do hereby agree to pay all fees, costs, charges and expenses which may be incurred and to allow, ratify and confirm whatsoever the said Advocates shall lawfully do or cause or procure to be done by virtue of these presents.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 18th day of August 1930.

BANGALORE,
Dated 12-8-30
18

Signed before me by the executant and personally known to me.

Accepted.

Advocate.

M. Ramachandra Rao

Advocates.

3563 29—THE BANGALORE PRESS

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Inwards

File No. 62 - 30

Serial No. 23

No. 978/4/15

Diary No. of letter replied to 254

General and Revenue Secretariat
(Inwards)
the *193* .

To

The Inwards Commr
in Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir,

Date of issue 31.10-30

Signed by Mr. V. S. Sastri

With reference to
Your letter No P.C.5/
29-30 dated the 30th/31st
July 1930 requesting
Cancellation of the
~~Cost~~ order appointing
one Sri Chikkaveeraya
as the Sole-Dharma
dersi of the Sri
Chowdeswari Temple
at Ramasetti
Bangalore. [illegible]

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

WD 02559—GPB—25,000—25-6-30

and recommending the appointment of a committee of Dharmadarsis to manage the affairs of the temple, I am directed to observe that the Chendy's order was passed in 1925 and that no allegations of mis-management are made against the Chikkaveerappa. I am accordingly to enquire ~~whether~~ if there is no rule of limitation in such matters as referred to is necessary or desirable for Govt to interfere and ~~if so, it must be made~~

The records connected with the case are returned herewith for perusal and return of the same with reply, if necessary.

C.C. M.S.R.

30.10.30

Secy to Govt

978 ans
upes

31st October 1930

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

With reference to your letter No. P.D.5 of 1929-30 dated the 30th/31st July 1930 requesting cancellation of the order appointing one Mr. Chikkaveerappa as the Sole Dharmadarsi of the Sri Chowdeswari temple at Ramasettypet, Bangalore City, and recommending the appointment of a Committee of Dharmadarsis to manage the affairs of the temple, I am directed to observe that Mr. Chandy's order was passed in 1925 and that no allegations of mismanagement are made against Mr. Chikkaveerappa. I am accordingly to enquire if there is no rule of limitation in such matters and whether it is necessary or desirable for Government to interfere now. The records connected with the case are returned herewith for reference and retransmission with a reply, if necessary.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

V Subrahmanyasastri
for Secretary to Government,
Law Department.

D.O.C.

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to:.....

Section

File No. 62-30.

Serial No.

No. 213

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue.....

Signed by..

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

To

~~Sir~~ Sir,

I am ~~desired~~ directed to ~~your~~ refer to this office ~~H~~ no 978 / Mog 62-30-3 & 31-10-3 ~~and the Subsequent Semester~~ enquiring ~~if there is no rule of limitation for Sole Dharmadarsiship~~ ~~Dharmadarsi Ship of Sri~~ ~~Arick Veerappa of Sri~~ in the matter of the Sole Dharmadarsiship Chowdeswari temple Ramasetpet Bangalore city & whether Govt interference now is necessary and to state that if a reply

received within 10 days
the ~~file~~ correspondence will be closed.

I have to
~~Yours truly~~

27.3.31

To. The Mun. Comr.

No. PC 5 Ewd Files 2930

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 7th April 1931

FROM

S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

Muz 62-30-4.

Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial *Department.*

SIR,

With reference to your letter No.978/~~Mux~~ Muz.62-30-2 dated - 31st October 1930 in the matter of the cancelling this office order appointing Mr. Chicka Veerappa as the Sole Dharmadarsi of the Sri Chowdéswari temple at Ramasettypet, Bangalore City, I have the honor to state that the question of limitation does not arise as against Government as they have the power of appointing or removing Dharmadarsis at any time. Such power has to be retained as otherwise a trustee who is mismanaging a Muzrai Institution will become practically ~~irr~~ irremoveable.

As regards the main question whether it is desirable to --- interfere at this stage, I have the honor to state that my predecessors recommendation ~~d~~ was based not on the present mismanagement of the trustee but on certain considerations connected with his appointment as sole trustee by Mr. Chandy. He has pointed out the various ----- reasons for Government interference and I need not repeat them here It will be enough to say that the present sole trustee and his --- father were trying to get the trustee ship for a long time, that it was opposed by the other parties and they were not successful. A committee of Dharmadarsis for the institution was appointed in 1924 by the Deputy Commissioner. Mr. Chikveerappa petitioned to this office to be appointed as sole Dharmadarsi and this was in the nature of an appeal against the formation of such a committee by the Deputy Commissioner. As the committee had been notified in

the

the Gazette, the other members should have in fairness, been heard before abolishing that committee and appointing Mr. Chikveerappa as Sole-Dharmadarsi. This was not done.

There is also a Civil Court order of 1886 to the effect that the father of Chik Veerappa was not entitled to be declared as a Sole Dharmadarsi. The fathers of the other Dharmadarsis were --- parties to the suit.

These facts seem to make out a prima facie case for the --- consideration of the matter by Government. I would, therefore request that some definite orders may be passed on my predecessors letter.

The entire file of vernacular papers is sent for reference and obliging return.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.





Before the Sovereignment of Mysore ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

1930—31 Mysore ನಂಬರು. 13

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್. ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪೋನೆಂಟ್.

Chikkaveerappa

VS.

1. Venkatanarayana
2. Gopalaswamy Narayanaswamy
3. Kamala

ಮ ರಾ||.....R. Gundu Rao, B.A., B.L. Advocate ಅವರಿಗೆ.

1 2 3 ನೇ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯವರ ಕಡೆಯ ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ.

ಈ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಪೈರುವರಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಗಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ, ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಪೊಬಲಗು ತಿಲ್ಕುಪೊಬಲಗು ಸಹಾ ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗಾಗಿ ರೀಫಂಡ್ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪನ್ನು ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮ್ಮ ಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೊ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಮುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ದನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶೆಟ್ಟಿಹಳ್ಳಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕವೀರಪ್ಪ

ತಾರೀಖು 10-5-31 ರುಜು ಅಯುಚವಾಂಕಾಚಿಕ್ಕವೀರಪ್ಪ

16.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

R. Gundu Rao,
10-5-31

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

R. Gundu Rao
Advocate.

☞ ಈ ಫಾರಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ ೨೬೨ ನೆ ನಂಬರು ಷಾಪ್‌ಕೀಪರ್ (ಹೆಚ್. ಬಿ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಶೆಟ್ಟರಲ್ಲಿ) ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತೆ.



V. R. VASUDEVA SASTRY, B.A., LL B.
ADVOCATE
ವಿ. ಆರ್. ವಾಸುದೇವಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿ, ಬಿ.ಎ., ಎಲ್.ಎಲ್.ಬಿ.
ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್

NO. 267, Chickpet
BANGALORE CITY

Date 1/7 1931.

To

The Secretary

Govt of Mysore

Bangalore

Sir

In pursuance of the notice No: 2548 Revenue dt 25. 5. 31. issued to me, desiring me to file power in Revenue dbis 18 & 30. 31. I herewith submit the Vakalat duly stamped and signed as desired by you.

Yours Sincerely

V. R. Vasudeva Sastry



Before the Govt of Mysore ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.
Bangalore:

19 —ನೇ Mung: Mis: No 13 of 30-31 ನಂಬರು

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್ | ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪೋನೆಂಟ್

M Chickveerappa | V.S. | Setty Nanjappa and 3 others.

ಮಾ|| ರಾ|| ವಿ. ಆರ್. ವಾಸುದೇವ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿ ಬಿ. ಎ., ಎಲ್. ಎಲ್. ಬಿ.,
ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಯವರಿಗೆ

ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ವರವಾಗಿ ಆಫೈರುವರಿನಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನವರ ಅಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ, ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಮೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಸಹ ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾವಸು ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲೀ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲೀ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡೆಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ದನಾಗಿ ಇಧೇನೆ

ತಾರೀಖು 1/6/31 | ರುಜು. ಶ್ರೀ ಕ ಅಯ್ಯ

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ | ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇಧೇನೆ

B. Vasudev

A. V. Govt Pleader Bangalore
Narasimhaiyar

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Muz

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 45-30/4574

To (1) M. Ramachandra Rao Esq BA BL Advocate

453 (2) R Chandra Rao Esq Advocate.

454 (3) V. R. Vasudeva Sastri Esq BA LLB Advocate

(Bangalore City)

Subject:— Muz Pet^n 13 of 30-31 re: the management The Sri Chowdeswari Temple. Ramaseshapet Bangalore City

Sir,

I am directed to

That when

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 28.9.31

Signed by M.V.S.

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 71—GBPM—40,000—20-7 31

Learned Sept 1931 You were good
enough to say that you would effect
a Settlement of the Case by Compromise
report the same for information
of Govt. I am to request
You to kindly send your report before the close of Oct
In Consultation with the advocate
on the other side of the parties have come
~~Such Settlement has been~~ Since to an amicable understanding
effected, as it is hoped that
the papers in the subject
~~have to be closed forthwith~~.

Thanking you
26.9.31
Yours obedt
Servt

GS
28/9

502
Onur

5th Octor.1931
64

To

M.R.Ry.Yajaman Chickveerappa,
Ramannanapet, Bangalore City.

With reference to his petition dated the 18th August 1930 about the managership of the Sri Ramalinga Chowdeswari Temple, Ramannanapet, Bangalore City, Mr.Chickveerappa is informed that he should report before 1st November 1931, the result of the settlement promised in his behalf on the date of the hearing of the case.

By order,

V Subrahmanyasastri
for Financial Secretary to Government
GS

Rev B (1-11-31)
7/10/31
B.h.M.

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Trng.

File No. —

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 502

To

R.R.Rs Jajamam Chikkaveerappa Esqr

Ramannarapet.

Bangalore City.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 6.10.31

Signed by Mr. V.S. (Paras 4 & 10 of the notes)

for instructions re-

malabandra Railway on the filing of

Criminal Suit & Action

Sections received from the

Dy Co Pontnl Peradle

order orders —

H. Keey) VS

30.9.31

List of enclosures .....

1/10/31

Copied by Issued

VS

2.10.31

Examined by .....

Re

In reply to his Petn Dy 18 Aug 1930

about the Management of the

Sri Ramalinga Chowdeswari Temple

Ramannarapet Bangalore

City, Mr Chikkaveerappa

is informed that his Counsel,

Mr Mr Rama Chandra

Rao, had undertaken at

the hearing of the case on

16/5/31 to effect a Settlement

by Compromise and the

further hearing

was

adjourned to 1/11/31

VS

1/11/31

(H. Keey) VS

5.11.31

Hd/11 VS

VD 714—GIPM—40,000—20-7-31

2 OCT 1931

~~The petitioner is requested to~~ Kindly be so

~~to~~ report the result of the settlement ~~and~~ ~~forward~~ in his ~~office~~

before 1st Nov. 1931

in the office ~~by~~ ~~hand~~ ~~delivery~~

~~Manager~~ Mr. Lewis, Mr. ~~Lewis~~

O.O.

30.9.31

11/9/31

Sec. to Govt

Town

G.S

30/9

GEN. & REV.
579
- DEC 1931
MUZRAI.

మిస్టర్ V R చాలా మంచి శాస్త్రవేత్త అయినా వెళ్ళకపోతే గారాబుగా పెరిగిన పిల్లలు చాలా విశ్వాసపరులు ఇదరంటే బాధపడే పిల్లలు, మంచి తల్లిదండ్రులను కలిగిన పిల్లలు మంచి ప్రయత్నం చేయగలరు/ కలిగిన తల్లిదండ్రులు రాజీపడి రాలుతూంటే మూడు నిమిషాల చిద్దాంత తల్లిదండ్రులు ఇదరడి నచ్చుతూ ది సిలు చూపి కన్నతల్లి పాలు చేసినట్లుగా నిర్ణయము పరిశీలించి చేయలు ప్రయత్నం చేయాలి.

ఈ చోట డిల్లీశ్వరి దేవి వలెయుం అనాదిగా ఉంది వస్తున్నది. ఇనాం నిమిషాలు బిందాస్ కాలదల్లి యుం ఇంగ్లీషులో డిల్లీశ్వరి దేవినాథ్ నచింపబలి ప్రేమసి లాగి తల్లిదండ్రుల దిగిపుతిల్ల చూడి దేవినాథ్ నిన్న ఎంబ్రాయిడరీ మాళ్ళలి చూడి నిమిషాలు చిద్దాంతం చేయలు ప్రయత్నం చేయాలి. మంచి ప్రయత్నం చేయాలి.

ఈ దేవినాథ్ నన్న కుర్చీదింద కాళ్ళక్రాం చు తెంగళుం 1న్న 1-3-4 ప్రేమించి ఇది, ఇనాం వి మగిళిగి ఇరువలి దిల్లి. ఇలగి డాబి గుళ్ళ తల్లిదండ్రులు

కుళ్ళకు సాంబశివుడు పాం అంటు పాంకలంకొట్టాడని నింద
వేసి కొట్టి చంపి శవాన్ని లచ్చాడిన్న పార్వతమ్మ ఇం
ట్లో పడుకోబెట్టి ఉదయం లేచి ఏమీ తెలియనట్టు ఇరుగు
పొరుగు వాళ్ళకు చెప్పి పాపం పసివాడు ఎలా పోయాడో
(150-0-0) రూపాయలు కుటుంబ ఖర్చులకు ఇవ్వమని
అంగడిగుళ్ళు చేసి ఇచ్చి నీ మీద ఈ పరమానందయ్య
శిష్యులకథలో బంధించబడ్డ కృష్ణుడిలా మిమ్మల్ని
మాయలు చేసి నిస్సహాయులుగా, కీలుబొమ్మలుగా తిరిగే
స్థితికి నిజమైన సింహాసనం బలుకుతున్నది. ఈ యుంపదిమ్మంది
శత్రువులు నిశ్శేషులు చేయడం ఎంత కంటు బలశాలి
అయినా ఎవరి వల్ల మీ ఎంపదవేల పాండవ
రుషులు సిద్ధులయ్యారు? ఇంద్రియ ప్రపంచాలకు అతీతులుగా
మనిషి ఎదిగిన ప్రతి ఒక్కరి వల్ల ఈ లోకం ఎలా
పాండవులు అవుతుందో మీకు మీరు నిజాయితీగా
మీ మనస్సాక్షిని అడిగి చూడండి. ఈ ఆధిక్యాంశ పరాజయాలు
మీ మనస్సులో ఎలాంటి ప్రభావం చూపుతున్నాయో
మీకే తెలుస్తుంది.

ఈ ఈ పార్వతమ్మ నుండి ఈ లోకంలో
ఎంతమంది నుండి నేర్చుకోవాలో మీకు నిర్ణయించుకోవడం
మీ ఇష్టం. ఇరుగు పొరుగు వాళ్ళ ప్రభావం ఎంత
ఉంటుందో మీకు తెలుసు. ఇరుగు పొరుగు వాళ్ళ
పట్ల ప్రేమ, జాలి, దయ, కరుణ, ఆప్యాయత, అనురాగం
పంచడంలో మీ మనస్సాక్షి ఎలా ప్రవర్తిస్తుందో
మీకు తెలుసు. ఇరుగు పొరుగు వాళ్ళ పట్ల
ద్వేషం, అసూయ, కోపం, పగ, ప్రతీకారం
పెంచుకోవడంలో మీ మనస్సాక్షి ఎలా ప్రవర్తిస్తుందో
మీకు తెలుసు. ఇరుగు పొరుగు వాళ్ళ

మండలేశ్వరులు కేమగి కుప్ప దారి ప్రభృతి
రాజులు చుంత్రే నెళ్ళి నిరబల్లరిం నన్న చదుళ్ళి చాయి దే
చిన్నాప్ప నళ్ళ యుంచసి ఊంయు చుం చుగాజెలు చ్చి దు
చుండియుం చుండు చంకియుం ఇల్ల. ఈ అజ్ఞ
దారనిగి ప్రసుంబూబ్, బాగి బందిలు చ చుళ్ళనే
రాంబ సారచళ్ళి దాని కరబ్బరిం నన్న చదుం, ధి చుం
శిన్ రాంగిదు కలుగళ్ళిగి ప్రచ కాళ్ళ చాంగిళలి బాం
చదిల్ల తకరంళో దాంశ్ర చుళ్ళ కాంట్రళ్ళ చాంగిలళ్ళి

౫. తకరంళో దాంశ్ర చుళుంచరంగిగి నింకు
చుగాజిసచళ్ళి దర్గిచరలు కరబ్బరాది గళ్ళిగి చుం చుళుంటి
నింకరి ప్రచరచర దర్గిసరిచళ్ళిల్ల, లిళ్ళసళ్ళిగు సుద్దాగు
కరగదు ళ్ళి కళ్ళ కళ్ళ ళ్ళిరుకాళ్ళి, ఇచర ఈ కుప్ప దారనిగి
తళ ఈ అజ్ఞ దారయుంచ తకరంళుం చుగాజిలు ళ్ళిదిల్ల.
ళ్ళిలుంళ మిం చంద రచళ్ళి యుం ప్రతిరి చుగాజిళ్ళుండి
కుళ్ళలని. తకరంళో దారనిగి ళ్ళిరుచ ధి రంరళ్ళిదే
ళ్ళిచి. ధ మూదిశిల్ రంగ చిల్లరి నన్న చదిల్ల తకరంళో దార
ఈ క్లైంసదంద తకరంళో ళ్ళి భూమ చాంగిది.

౬. ఈగ తకరంళో దారర ళ్ళిగ్రహరిం చెళ్ళరి ధ మూ
దళ్ళిళ్ళ రన్న నిల్లమం చుండి దర్శ దళి :—

ఎ. ఈ అజ్ఞ దారనిగి చంళ పొరంబలు చాంగి నెదదు
బందిలు చ నెలుల్లలో చుళ్ళనే జరిం చ కాళమ ళ్ళిప్పుచము

బి. దర్గిచసాప్ప నళ్ళ యుంచ చేం రంయుం ఒబ్బళ్ళి చూడ్ళ
డ ళ్ళిరుచ తకరంళు దారరు ఇల్లది ఇరళ్ళర్ తకరంళు
గళ్ళు కేలుది ఈ అజ్ఞ దారనిగి కులజిగళ్ళు గొంబ్బళ్ళి కేల
కుగళ్ళుంచూ గుంపుదు.

ఈ అజ్ఞ దార, ఈ కరన డి రింయురు ప్రనేలకం డుగా

ఒబ్బో మగాడి మండిన కళ్ళ నిండా చీకట్లను నింపిలాంటి
పోలీసు కళ్ళైతే బంబీ కొట్టి కొట్టి గిలాయించి తీ
ఆఫీసరునీ మీ కన్నవ యిలా చేసియుంటిళ్ళు.

ఈ ఆఫీసరన్న నన్ను సెంట్రల్ మంత్రులోచరు
కిటికీ నుండి కట్టిన ధ్వమూ దగ్గర్లో ఒబ్బనన్నాగి
నేనుమం చంజిదాపదళి నీ కాళ్ళ దవళు ఐందుండల
కర్రలై కట్టి చంజినంకర కిట్టి నీవదు యం బడ్డావ
నాకు మండుకొచ్చిదు ఐలగితిగుచద్దరింద ఈ ఆఫీసర్
దానినీ ధ్వమూ దగ్గర కనవు కట్టి పోలీసు పద
కర్ర నీ సంశయంచుల్ల - ఐలగాందర్ల జుజువి రన్నట్
గ్రూపు 1-3-4 లందచదివి శిలపి నీ దొరికుయ్యిదిల్ల
ఇవి చదళు నీ కాంయుచుగాడు కీదిల్ల దర్శన కాండ్లు నమూలి
నీ విద్యాల్ల కళ్ళ - ఐరింతు కర్రలదింద నీవడిదుబంద
మునీ కనవద శాళవ చుంటోగాని, శీలచేగర్ల కిందిస్థ
కాళ్ళు కళ్ళైతే బంయుచు దర్ ఈ ఆఫీసరన్నన
నళ్ళ కారణమాయింది.

వీలనాడ్ నళ్ళ చుంజకర్ ఒబ్బో భద్రిముఖ
మునీ కనవద శాళవ ఈ ఎలడన్ను లాగు పిరిసేసొండియుళ్ళి.
ఈ ఆఫీసరయుంజాంగలుం కట్టి దర్శనారుచ మునీ
కనవద శాళవ నీ కాళ్ళ దవళు దుంచుచుంజడి లుంగ్ నీ
కట్టి చ్చుళి - దర్శవర్ల భద్రిం యుంచిగి కన్న దుపెం బ
లబ్ధిం చుంచదింద ఒబ్బో మగాడి వీలనశీలచేగర్ల
నిలిపిసొండు బళలు ప్రజోపయోగానిగుం ఈ కనవం
శస్త్రాలగుం దిలంగో ఇరుక్కో ఈ అంశ మీడాల్సిమ
గువళు నావష్థానబాధి యిలా ఆపిసిదళి నాన్నయుచిన్న

చదువు పరిధ్నపాంకుళ్ళ

4 (a) తిరియురకాంలదింద విశేషి విచారి మంచి చుట్టు నిలిచి మేంచు నడిపి ప్లేండు బంచిరి చదు, చుంచిలుం నడిపిసుకొ కింబ నంబికేచుచే లుళ్ళ రస్థాక దవర చేక్కే బందు, ధ చుట్టూ దశ్లగ్ధన్ని నిలుంచుకొచుంచి బడ్డుపాంచాంగుల్ను కట్టిసి సైవిందుల్లి రతక్కే చుట్టుచుట్టూ పీల్చి ప్రేసి నిల్లిళ్ళకో, కుంకినచుళ్ళ పేంచుంచుకొనాబిచి తిల్లిపాంల యుంగ్గికి చుటాంచు కు అంయుగ్గొ నివరన్ని, చుటాంచు క్రిగాబి ధ్నాంచు గైచళాంకిర గాం సైక్రైంయురకన్ని చంళపికొం పీళ్ళ చాంది సేంగాలో మేళ్ళ నల్లిచాంకిరయు కొయ్యి Comp. కి రిసు 191/26-27 14-5-27 ధ.ం 15-46-50 కొయ్యి 65-23-కి 26-4-24

ఆ తిరియురకాంల అష్టు సరి ఆగిది, చుట్టూసి చి నగకంగరపీళ్ళబి ఆగి చిలుంచురకము గా సాబ్చి చి తిల్లిపనాధ్నసన్ని తిరియురకాంల దింద చిళ్ళపాంచు నడిపిసిం గుచు విశేషిళ్ళ బంగి చుట్టూడి చిల్లిపరశిల్లిచిగ్గు సాడిసిపేంచుచు బందచ్చి దింద ఆ ధ్నాంమిలి (Family) ఖాంరచదన్ని రాంపి డబ్బాలింబ బ్రాంచనిసిన్నా రదవరు యుంగాబిసి మిస్సుంగో చిలుంచురకళ్ళం శిక్రన్ని రంగాచిల్లనర నాళ్ళకింబల్లి ఇకడబ ధ.ం 24-8-5 కొయ్యి 75-25-కి 9-8-26 ఆశ్చర్యకరంగా ఉంది, ఈలాంటి డకోయిట్లను చుంచిలుచి లుచ్చివాళ్ళ చేల ఈ అజిగ్ధాంరన చిబ్బారదల్లి యుం ధ్నసలుళ్ళ సరిరదవరు యుంగా చిసి చంళపిసం చుర, సేంగాలో మళ్ళనేల చుర నాళ్ళకి ఇకడబ్బాలింకలుం లచిగ్ధాంరనను ఆచ్చిం ప్రేంలు పీడుకొన్నాని.

(b) ఒందుచేళ్ళి ఈంగి ఆశ్చర్యకర చుంగడలు నీళ్ళారదవరంగే

23.12.31



Before the Government of Mysore,
Bangalore

Mung: Mis No: 13 of 1930-31

petitioners.	opponent
yj: Shankarappa and others	yj. Chickveerappa

Re. the appointment of Dharmadarsies to Sri. Ramalinga Chowdeswari Temple. Bangalore.

yajman Shankarappa, one of the petitioners begs to state as follows

(1) That on 16. 5. 1931 when the above Case was heard before the Honourable Government, all the parties agreed to effect a Settlement of the Case by Compromise and report the Same to Government.

(2). This petitioner Submits, that though many attempts were made to effect a compromise

the parties could not arrive to an amicable settlement.

3. This petitioner further submits that he is the yajmaan of the Hanmaa Devanga Community and is one of the Utsava Murthis and he apprehends inconvenience and trouble if he is not appointed as one of the Dharma Darsies. The petitioner prays that the Government may kindly be pleased to consider the allegations made by him in his petition.

4. In the Event of the Honourable Government proceeding further and pass orders appointing Dharma darsies, this petitioner prays that the Government may be pleased to appoint him as one of the Dharmadarsies. So that his Community Interests may be cared for.

5. As the petitioner was out of station for some time, this submission could not be made early

Wherefore, this petitioner prays that this Honourable Court may be pleased to appoint him as one of the Dharma Darsies for the aforesaid Temple.

Dt: 28/12/81.
Bangalore

Petitioner

[Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Muz.

File No. 62-30

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to 668

No 969

To

R. Gundu Rao Esq.

Advocate. Bangalore City.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 12/1/32

Signed by M. A. Subbarao

Subject:— Muz Appl No 13 of 30-31 regarding the management of the Sri Chandeshwari Temple Ramasetty - Kar. Bangalore City.

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

Sir,

I am directed to invite reference to this office letter No 45'3/Muz dt 28.9.31 calling for a reply before the close of Oct 1931 if an amicable understanding on the above subject was arrived at between the parties and to request

You be so good as to ~~favour me with~~ send your
~~your~~ list to me before the 20th inst. ~~as to lands~~
~~this district~~ required.

Thanking you.

Yours faithfully
for Secretary

SS
17/1/22

[illegible]

[illegible].

Appeal petition No.13 of 1943-44.

Appellant. Respondent.

[illegible] [illegible].
[illegible].
[illegible].

[illegible].
[illegible].

Subject.

Prayer of the petitioner for [illegible] the [illegible] Manager of [illegible] Kumaramangalam dated 15th [illegible] Nandalore dated 15th [illegible].

The case was heard on 16th May 1944. [illegible] parties were present. Petitioner was represented by [illegible] Kumaramangalam Bros. Dr. [illegible] counter petitioners [illegible] appeared for counter petitioners [illegible].

As the parties agreed to effect a [illegible] mise, their respective [illegible] unable to settle the [illegible] to be decided on its merits.

[illegible]

[illegible] 23rd [illegible].

The res [illegible] City, [illegible] Municipality [illegible] and it would [illegible] tion. The [illegible] at the main [illegible] petition of the [illegible] ment, as suggested by the [illegible] Kumaramangalam [illegible] of [illegible].

condition depends upon the interest of its only devotees who have made or are prepared to make substantial cash contributions towards its maintenance. It is seen from the records that the petitioner-Mr. Chick Veerappa and his family have evinced considerable interest in improving the resources of the Institution and it is desirable, therefore, that the temple should be assured of the continued support of this family. Mr. Chick Veerappa may, therefore, be suggested by the Board Commissioner be made the convener of the committee of Dharmadarsi. In his representation dated 2nd November 1951, Mr. Chick Veerappa prays that, if he cannot be appointed as the sole Dharmadarsi, the office of the convener at least, might be allowed to be held hereditarily by the members of his family. A convener's place cannot be permitted to be treated as a hereditary office. As the family of Mr. Chick Veerappa takes in the future the same interest in the Institution as it has done in the past and if at any time there are found among the members of that family competent to act in the place of the Convener, one of them might be permitted to continue to hold it. The Committee of Dharmadarsi now to be formed should consist of Mr. Chick Veerappa as its convener and a minimum number of members to represent the different sects of the temple's devotees.

All receipts of the temple, from whatever source, should be kept in the Government Savings Bank account in the name of the temple and all monies required for expenses should be drawn from that account. An annual audit of the accounts to operate upon this account. Proper accounts should be kept of all receipts and charges of the temple and the temple committee should be supported by vouchers for it.

1355 to the D.C.
1356. to the Petitioner Mr. Chickveerappa
1357 to Dr. R. Sundara Rao, Advocate
1358 to Dr. V. R. Nagendra Rao, Advocate
1359 to the Counsel

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

~~Appeal~~ Petn No. 13 of 30-31

~~Appellant.~~ Petitioner Vs. ~~Respondent.~~ Counter-Petitioners

Petitioner
Rajaguru Chickaveerabba.

A. 1- Setty Nanjappa
2- Rajaguru Nanjundiah
3- Rajaguru Ramaiya

B. 1- Rajaguru Shamanappa
2- Rajaguru Papanna.

Subject.

~~Request~~ Prayer of the petitioner for his continuance as the sole manager of Sri Ramalinga Chidambaram temple in Ramanagara for Banglore city.

The case was heard on 16th May 1931 - Both parties were present, ~~the petitioner was~~ Petr represented by his Counsel Mr M. Ramachandra Rao. ~~The Counter petitioners were present~~ - Mr R. Gundu Rao Counter Petrs Advocate, ~~appeared for them~~ group A. Mr C. R. Vasudeva Sastri Advocate appeared for ~~the~~ Shamanna ~~respondent~~ in group B.

As the parties agreed to effect a settlement by compromise, their request was granted and they were urged to effect the same

RPB-500-12-5-31

arrived as - The parties have been able to
the differences between them & the case has
therefore to be decided on its merits.

0208/

(Items entered in pages 56 and 57 of this Book)

Memo No 1356/mwg 62-30-5 dt 29/3/32/ one Book
copy to the Jeh[illegible] in Chickaballa
re his petition enclosing received from him

B-O

28/3/32

Dr Secy lodged
Roop

No 1357/mwg 62-30-5 dt 29/3/32
Copy to Mr R. Gundu Rao Advocate - Bangalore

B-O 25/3/32 cit

Dr Secy lodged
Roop

1358/mwg 62-30-5 dt 29/3/32
Copy to Mr C. R. Vasudeva Sastri Advocate-

1359/mwg dt 29/3/32 to Chickaballa

B-O 25/3/32

Dr Secy lodged
Roop

Copy to Mr Gajanana Setty
B.O 25/3/32
Dr Secy lodged
Roop

Memo No 1355/mwg 62-30-5 dt 29/3/32
Copy to the B-C for necessary action with
regard to correspondence ending with his
letter No P.C 5/29-30 dt 8/4/31. The entire
records received from him are herewith returned

B-C
28/3/32
Dr Secy lodged
Roop

Bangalore District.

Notification dated 17th May 1924

- - - -

Under Section 15 of the Muzrai Regulati and the rules framed thereunder, the under-mentioned gentlemen are appointed Dharmadarsis for the management of Sri Chowdeswari temple of Nagarthpet and Ramannapet in the Bangalore City for a period of 5 years from this date.

1. Mr. Vegaman Chickkaveerappa (Convenor)
2. " Setty Nanjappa
3. " Vejaman Nanjundiah
4. " " Papanna
5. " " Sankarappa

B.Venkoba Rao.

Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore Dt.

Copy.

E NOTES.

etc., not intended for permanent record.]

The Atty Lawyer is
~~Respondent~~ (Respondents)
name in file dtd
62-30 Let's blank
Answer has been filed
Law

Sept 15

Formal
Receipt of the
Vakalat, This have to
be file duly -
Sd/-

E NOTES

etc, not intended for permanent record]

Mr Vasudeva Sastri appeared on 16/5/31 at the time of hearing. He was no doubt asked to ~~bring~~ file the Vakalat but was not forthcoming from him.

D/s Called for in same is ruled for orals.

S-S.R.
22/5

Issue
22.5.31

Signed

Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied for slips pasted on this form

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

NOTE.—Should routine notes be written on memorandum slips, the notes must be copied on this form.

W[illegible]—(21)—70000-2-21

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
the 193

Date of issue 25-5-31

Signed by Jm V.S. Carthy

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section Muz

File No.

Serial No.

No. 2548

To

Vasudeva Sastri Esq BA LLB.
Advocate. Chicacole.
Bangalore City.

Sir,

I am directed to request you to be so good as to immediately forward the Vakalat in Muz Misc Pet No 130 of 30-31 in which case you appeared for one of the Counter petitioners on 16/5/31 before the First Member of Council

Etc Name Etc

[over

WD 02559—GPB—25,000—25-6-30

-5-
22/5/

7-1 Dept